REMARKS

In the Office Action[1], the Examiner objected to claim 57; rejected claims 5 and 15

under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-11 and 15-17 under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,768,382 to Schneier et al.

("*Schneier*"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,671,412 to Christiano ("*Christiano*"), in view of

U.S. Patent No. 5,629,980 to Stefik et al. ("*Stefik*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent

No. 7,103,574 to Peinado et al. ("*Peinado*"); rejected claims 18-22 under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) as unpatentable over *Schneier*, *Christiano*, *Stefik*, *Peinado*, and further in view

of U.S. Patent No. 5,590,288 to Castor et al. ("*Castor*"); and rejected claim 57 under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Christiano*, *Stefik*, and *Peinado*.

Applicants have amended claims 5, 15, and 57, and claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 15-22,

and 57 remain pending.

Regarding the objection to claim 57, Applicants have amended claim 57 as

suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw

the objection to claim 57.

Regarding the rejection of claims 5 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second

paragraph, Applicants have amended claims 5 and 15 to depend from claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 5 and

15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 15-22, and 57

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

---

[1] The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Claim 1 recites a data processing apparatus including, for example:

. . .

a hash-value generating circuit that <u>generates hash values of the content data, the content key data, and the usage control policy data;</u>
a public key encryption circuit that <u>creates signature data using the hash values and verifies the integrity of the signature data</u>

. . .

(emphasis added).

The Examiner correctly states that *Schneier*, *Christiano*, and *Stefik* do not disclose "generating a hash value of the key data and the usage control policy data" (Office Action at page 7). Therefore, *Schneier*, *Christiano*, and *Stefik* fail to teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, "a hash-value generating circuit that generates hash values of the content data, the content key data, and the usage control policy data" and "a public key encryption circuit that creates signature data using the hash values and verifies the integrity of the signature data," as recited in claim 1.

Peinado does not cure the deficiencies of *Schneier*, *Christiano*, and *Stefik*.

Peinado discloses a method for digital rights management. According to *Peinado*, a DRM system may direct a "user to a license server to obtain a license" or may transparently obtain a "license from such license server without any action necessarily on the part of the user" (col. 2, lines 53-58). The license may include a decryption key that "decrypts the encrypted data," "a description of the rights . . . conferred by the license and related conditions," and "a digital signature that ensures the integrity of the license" (col. 2, lines 59-65).

The Examiner cites col. 20, line 38 - col. 21, line 12 of *Peinado* to disclose the claimed "hash-value generating circuit that generates hash values of the content data, the content key data, and the usage control policy data" and "public key encryption circuit that creates signature data using the hash values and verifies the integrity of the signature data" (Office Action at page 7). Applicants respectfully disagree.

This passage of *Peinado* discloses the elements that license 16 may include. License 16 may include a content ID, Digital Rights License, decryption key, digital signature, and certificate. Applicants find no teaching in this passage or any other passage of *Peinado* of the claimed "hash-value generating circuit" that generates hash values of 1) "the content key data" and 2) "the usage control policy data," as recited in claim 1.

Peinado does not generate hash values of "the content key data" and "the usage control policy data." In addition, claim 1 also recites "a public key encryption circuit" that 1) "creates signature data using the hash values" and 2) "verifies the integrity of the signature data." While *Peinado* mentions a signature, any signature data that may exist is not created using "hash values of the content data, the content key data, and the usage control policy data."

Therefore, *Peinado* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, "a hash-value generating circuit that generates hash values of the content data, the content key data, and the usage control policy data" and "a public key encryption circuit that creates signature data using the hash values and verifies the integrity of the signature data," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, *Schneier, Christiano, Stefik,* and *Peinado* fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore allowable for at least the reasons presented above. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7-11, 15, and 16 depend from claim 1 and are thus also allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claims 17 and 57, though of different scope from claim 1, are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Although the Examiner cites *Castor* in the rejection of dependent claims 18-22, Applicants respectfully assert that *Castor* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Schneier, Christiano, Stefik,* and *Peinado* discussed above. Therefore, claims 18-22 are also allowable at least due to their dependence from claim 17.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and withdrawal of the rejections. Pending claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 15-22, and 57 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants request a favorable action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 16, 2008   By:___/David W. Hill/_____
                                                        David W. Hill
                                                        Reg. No. 28,220